

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JAMES STEVEN PAULEY,

Petitioner,

V.

STEVEN SINCLAIR,

Respondent.

Case No. C14-1536 RSL-BAT

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Petitioner James Steven Pauley filed this action under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging his April 12, 2010 conviction in King County Superior Court for second degree assault, vehicular assault, first degree robbery, and attempting to elude a police vehicle. Dkt. 1-1, p. 1. The Court's records reflect that the petition is a second or successive petition which must be transferred to the Ninth Circuit. Petitioner is also no longer in custody.

DISCUSSION

Petitioner previously filed a federal petition for habeas corpus relating to his 2010 conviction. His federal petition was denied on the merits and dismissed by the District Court on July 29, 2014. *See Pauley v. Sinclair*, USDC No. C14-151-JCC (Dkts. 19 and 20 therein).

Petitioner's current petition appears to be a second or successive petition. If a petition is second or successive, then petitioner must seek authorization from the Court of Appeals before filing the new petition with the district court. 28 U.S.C. § 2244 (b) (3) (A). Ninth Circuit Rule

1 22-3 (a) provides guidance:

2 Any petitioner seeking leave to file a second or successive 2254 petition or 2255
3 motion in district court must seek leave under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2244 or 2255. An
4 original and five copies of the application must be filed with the Clerk of the
5 Court of Appeals. No filing fee is required. If a second or successive petition or
6 motion, or application for leave to file such a petition or motion, is mistakenly
7 submitted to the district court, the district court shall refer it to the court of
8 appeals.

9 **CONCLUSION**

10 The Court recommends that this petition be referred to the Ninth Circuit and that the file
11 be administratively closed without deciding whether the petition should be dismissed.

12 Any objections to this Recommendation must be filed and served upon all parties no later
13 than **Monday, November 10, 2014**. The Clerk should note the matter for **Wednesday,**
14 **November 12, 2014**, as ready for the District Judge's consideration if no objection is filed. If
15 objections are filed, any response is due within 14 days after being served with the objections. A
16 party filing an objection must note the matter for the Court's consideration 14 days from the date
17 the objection is filed and served. The matter will then be ready for the Court's consideration on
18 the date the response is due. Objections and responses shall not exceed twelve (12) pages. The
19 failure to timely object may affect the right to appeal.

20 DATED this 20th day of October, 2014.

21
22
23


BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA
United States Magistrate Judge